

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-4, 8-12, 14, 15, 19-23, 25, 26 and 28 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 14 and 25 have been amended. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

### **I. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness**

Claims 1-4, 8-11, 14, 15, 19-22, 25, 26 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Nassar (European Patent Application No. EP 1096405 A2), hereinafter “Nassar” in view of Anderson et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0178226), hereinafter “Anderson” in view of Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,263,358), hereinafter “Lee” and further in view of Bekkers (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0019509), hereinafter “Bekkers”. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to Claim 1, Applicants have amended such claim to further emphasize advantages provided by the highly automated dynamic itinerary monitoring system that automatically makes changes to a user’s travel accommodations based on changes to an itinerary. The notification that is provided to the user is provided by the same dynamic itinerary monitoring system that actually made the changes for the user (without user involvement), and includes the actual changes that were automatically made by the dynamic itinerary monitoring system – both changes made to certain ones of the old segments, as well as new additions. The cited Nassar reference, which is cited as teaching the claimed notification feature, merely provides a passive notification that a change to an itinerary has occurred (your flight has been delayed) but provides no information as to actual changes made to the underlying travel plan – by the monitoring system itself, without user involvement – that were automatically made in response to such itinerary change. In fact, there would be no reason for Nassar to provide such a notification as the Nassar end-user themselves made the changes to the underlying accommodations and therefore there would be no need to provide such a notification as the end-user is already aware of such changes as they made them themselves (such user-provided changes are described at, for example, Nassar col. 3, paragraph [0013], albeit with user assistance provided by the travel intelligence center server). Thus, it is urged that the current amendment to Claim 1 has overcome the present rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Applicants traverse the rejection of Claims 2-4, 8-11, 14, 15, 19-22, 25, 26 and 28 for similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claim 1.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-4, 8-11, 14, 15, 19-22, 25, 26 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

## **II. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness**

Claims 12 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Nassar, in view of Anderson in view of Lee and further in view of Zobell et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,606,553), hereinafter “Zobell”. This rejection is respectfully traversed for similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claim 1 (of which Claim 12 ultimately depends upon). For example, Zobell is directed to an air traffic control system which reroutes flights based on weather conditions, and is not geared toward or directed to any type of end-user notification functionality such as the provided by Claim 1.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 12 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

## **III. Conclusion**

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited references and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: May 27, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Wayne P. Bailey/

Wayne P. Bailey  
Reg. No. 34,289  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 385-8777  
Attorney for Applicants